

APPENDIX B

1 MICHAEL A. JACOBS (CA SBN 111664)
2 MJacobs@mofo.com
3 ARTURO J. GONZÁLEZ (CA SBN 121490)
4 AGonzalez@mofo.com
5 ERIC A. TATE (CA SBN 178719)
6 ETate@mofo.com
7 RUDY Y. KIM (CA SBN 199426)
8 RKKim@mofo.com
9 MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
10 425 Market Street
11 San Francisco, California 94105-2482
12 Telephone: 415.268.7000
13 Facsimile: 415.268.7522

14 KAREN L. DUNN (*Pro Hac Vice*)
kdunn@bsfllp.com
15 HAMISH P.M. HUME (*Pro Hac Vice*)
hhume@bsfllp.com
16 BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP
17 1401 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington DC 20005
Telephone: 202.237.2727
Facsimile: 202.237.6131

18 Attorneys for Defendants
19 UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
20 and OTTOMOTTO LLC

21 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
22 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
23 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

24 WAYMO LLC,
25 Plaintiff,
26 v.
27 UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
28 OTTOMOTTO LLC; OTTO TRUCKING LLC,
Defendants.

Case No. 3:17-cv-00939-WHA

**DEFENDANTS UBER
TECHNOLOGIES, INC. AND
OTTOMOTTO LLC’S
SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSES TO
WAYMO’S FIRST SET OF
EXPEDITED INTERROGATORIES
PURSUANT TO PARAGRAPH SIX OF
THE MAY 11, 2017 PRELIMINARY
INJUNCTION ORDER (NOS. 1, 3, 6)**

1 destroyed the discs. Uber never received those discs, and does not know whether those discs
2 contained any of the “DOWNLOADED MATERIALS.”

3 **INTERROGATORY NO. 3:**

4 IDENTIFY all Uber Devices and Non-Uber Devices (as those terms are defined in
5 UBER00006444) that LEVANDOWSKI has used to access any of DEFENDANTS’ Networks
6 (as that term is defined in UBER00006444), or that LEVANDOWSKI could have used to access
7 any of DEFENDANTS’ Networks (as that term is defined in UBER00006444).

8 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 3:**

9 ~~Defendants object to this interrogatory because it implicates information protected by the~~
10 ~~attorney client privilege, the work product doctrine, and the common interest and joint defense~~
11 ~~privileges. Defendants further objects to this interrogatory to the extent it purports to require~~
12 ~~expert opinion. Defendants further object to the interrogatory as vague, ambiguous, and~~
13 ~~overbroad because it asks for the identity of any device that Levandowski “could have used” to~~
14 ~~access Defendants’ networks, which is infinite in scope.~~

15 ~~Subject to and without waiving the general and specific objections above, Defendants~~
16 ~~respond as follows:~~

17 ~~To Defendants’ knowledge, Mr. Levandowski used two devices to access Uber’s~~
18 ~~networks:~~

- 19 1. ~~A MacBook Pro (15 inch, 2016) computer provided to Mr. Levandowski by Uber~~
20 2. ~~A personal MacBook Pro (not issued by Uber)~~

21 **SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 3:**

22 Subject to and without waiving the general and specific objections above, Defendants
23 respond as follows:

24 To Defendants’ knowledge, Mr. Levandowski used three devices to access Uber’s
25 networks:

- 26 1. A MacBook Pro (15-inch, 2016) computer provided to Mr. Levandowski by Uber
27 2. A MacBook Pro (not issued by Uber)
28 3. An iPhone 7 provided to Mr. Levandowski by Uber

1 ~~Anthony Levandowski and Mr. Ron in October 2016.~~

2

3 Dated: August 24, 2017

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

4

5 By: /s/ Arturo J. González
ARTURO J. GONZÁLEZ

6 Attorneys for Defendants
7 UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
and OTTOMOTTO LLC

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1	I. Neel Chatterjee GOODWIN PROCTER LLP 135 Commonwealth Drive Menlo Park, CA94025	nchatterjee@goodwinlaw.com bschuman@goodwinlaw.com rwalsh@goodwinlaw.com
2	Brett M. Schuman Rachel M. Walsh GOODWIN PROCTER LLP Three Embarcadero Center San Francisco, California 94111	

3
4
5
6
7 I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed at Palo
8
9 Alto, California, this 24th day of August, 2017.

10 _____
11 Ethel Villegas
12 (typed)

13 _____
14 /s/ *Ethel Villegas*
15 (signature)

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY

VERIFICATION

1 I, Eric Meyhofer, declare:

2 1. I am Head of ATG for Defendant Uber Technologies, Inc. (“Uber”) in the above-
3 captioned action, and I am authorized to execute this verification on behalf of Uber and
4 Ottomotto LLC.

5 2. I have read Defendants Uber Technologies, Inc. and Ottomotto LLC’s
6 Supplemental Responses to Waymo’s First Set of Expedited Interrogatories (Nos. 1, 3, 6) (the
7 “Responses”), and know the contents thereof.

8 3. I am informed and believe that the matters stated in the Responses are true and
9 correct and, on that ground, allege that the matters stated therein are true and correct.

10
11 I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

12 Executed this 22nd day of October, 2017, at Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

13
14
15 
Eric Meyhofer